



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant	Burbank Water and Power	County	Los Angeles
Project Title	Burbank Water and Power Well Destruction Project	Grant Request	\$ 110,000.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 112,500.00

Project Description: The proposed scope of work includes the destruction of two former production wells in the vicinity of a VOC contaminated groundwater plume. The destruction of the wells minimizes the potential for increased groundwater contamination via a vertical conduit or through operation.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	8
Budget	2
Schedule	3
QA/QC	4
Past Performance	5
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	32

- **GWMP or Program:** The proposed project is located within the San Fernando adjudicated basin which is part of the Upper Los Angeles River Area (ULARA) watershed. Applicant provides the final Court Judgment as proof of adjudication.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** This criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. Applicant provides a good description of the project and states that although the proposed well destruction is neither supported nor conditioned in the court adjudicated order, it is supported by ULARA Watermaster and the US EPA and considered a responsible and necessary measure to protect and manage groundwater. Applicant further explains that the project is consistent with the ULARA Groundwater Management Plan goal to protect and improve the quality of stored water within the basin and EPA's request not to operate these wells to avoid further hydraulic influence on the contaminant plume. The project will eliminate the potential contamination of groundwater posed by the inactive wells serving as vertical conduits and considering the extent of contaminants within the San Fernando Basin the long term need and benefit of the project are significant. Due to proximity to a Superfund site, applicant coordinates with EPA and plans to work with County Public Health Department in developing well destruction plans and notify the public through its website and by direct mailers. No ongoing use or maintenance is required because the proposed well destruction will be complete and permanent.
- **Work Plan:** Criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. A reduced score is based on the following: 1) Applicant does not provide sufficient detail in Task 3 - Preparation of Well Destruction Plans," or the well destruction itself (Task 4.3 and 4.4). While some destruction details are provided in Task 4.3/4.4, some important details are omitted including: destruction method, material type, and standard practices to be used). At a minimum, applicant should indicate that these details will be developed in Task 3, and should indicate (at a minimum), that the method developed and implemented will be in accordance with state or local well destruction standards (as indicated in Att. 8); and 2) Project deliverables are not clear or well organized. For example, Section E – Project Deliverables: This task is not a full accounting of all project deliverables. Deliverables that are described in Att. 5 but omitted from Task E include: 1) the CEQA document; and the DWR Well Completion Report, which are described under Task 5.2, and section G, respectively. Either Task E should include all project deliverables, or, each Task should clearly identify what deliverables are included for that task. Otherwise, applicant adequately addresses this criterion, including a Work Plan that is consistent with the budget and schedule, and includes tasks that both reasonably fulfill the objectives of the proposal and relate to improving GW management.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Budget:** Criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. A reduced score is based on the following: 1) While a summary budget table is provided that indicates both the estimated cost at the Task level, and similarly the cost share and grant share amounts, there is no further detailed cost break-down to the sub-task level, which is inconsistent with the Work Plan, and result in a cost estimate that is too generalized to evaluate whether or not costs shown are reasonable; 2) There is little supporting information provided for the cost estimates provided. For instance, no Task includes labor categories, hourly rates or labor time estimates (or invoices from prior well destruction work), and with the exception of Task 4, a cost basis is not provided. For Task 4 (Execution of Well Destruction Plan), applicant's estimate is based on 2006/07 prices adjusted for inflation; however, there is no discussion provided to indicate that the prior wells destroyed are similar to those proposed to justify using the old quote; and 3) \$2,500 is identified in Task 1 as Non-State Share, however, the source for the funding is not identified.
- **Schedule:** Criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. A reduced score is based on the following: 1) Applicant does not: describe a readiness to proceed when funding becomes available (although the timeline is within that specified by the PSP), explain how obstacles would be resolved to keep on schedule, or, explain how the schedule was derived, all elements required by the PSP; and 2) While the Schedule is generally consistent with the work plan and budget in content, the "Outline Numbers" indicated for each Task do not correspond to the Task numbers shown in the Work Plan or Budget. And, CEQA compliance and permitting tasks, while provided in the work plan, are not shown in the Schedule.
- **QA/QC:** Criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. A reduced score is based on the following: Applicant does not adequately incorporate the QA/QC measures identified in this Attachment into the Work Plan. For instance, while this attachment specifies that 1) The selected contractor will be required to comply with [DWR Bulletins 74-81 and 74-90 Standards] and will be required to possess a C-57 Water Well Contractor's License, this information is not incorporated into the Work Plan, as required by the PSP.
- **Past Performance:** Criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Applicant addresses all required elements of this criterion, including: demonstrating, through performance on past projects, the capability to perform high quality work, managing funds, and meeting deadlines for similar types of projects; and provides specific examples for projects that were completed on time and on budget. For one project example (Solar Carport Project), applicant includes a DOE site visit report, which is complimentary in regard to applicant's administration of the grant to date and indicated project was on track to be completed within the grant period of performance.